

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-18 are pending, with claims 1, 4, 7, 12, and 17 being independent.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 12 have been amended and claims 8, 19, and 20 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 14-16

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-3, 5-6, and 14-16 ultimately depend. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 10 and 11 at least in the alternative. In particular, the “accepts as input” language added to the end of claim 1 is from claim 10, which depends from intervening claim 9, and the “provides as output” language added to the end of claim 1 is from claim 11, which also depends from intervening claim 9. Both claims 10 and 11 were objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of their base claims, and any intervening claims.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable because it now includes the subject matter of claims 10 and 11 at least in the alternative, and also includes the subject matter of intervening claim 9. The subject matter of claims 10 and 11 is part of claim 1 “at least in the alternative” because claim 9’s gun mount control interface software component is recited in claim 1 as “at least one of:” claim 10’s “accepts as input” and claim 11’s “provides as output.” Thus, the gun mount control interface software component of claim 1 either includes the “accepts as input” limitation per claim 10; includes the “provides as output” limitation per claim 11; or includes both the “accepts as input” and “provides as output” limitations per claims 10 and 11.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 14-16 are allowable because they depend from allowable base independent claim 1.

Claims 4, 12-13

Claims 4 and 12 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of their base independent claims and any intervening claims. Claim 4 originally depended from claim 3, which depends from claim 1, whereas claim 12 directly depended from claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claims 1 and 3, and claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claim 1. Claims 4 and 12 are thus allowable, and claim 13 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable base claim 12.

Claims 7-11

Claims 7 and 8 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of their base independent claims and any intervening claims. Both claims 7 and 8 originally depended from claim 6, which depends from claim 1. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claims 1 and 6.

Furthermore, claim 7 has been amended so that the “accepts as input” language is claimed at least in the alternative with the “provides as output” language of claim 8, and claim 8 has been cancelled. That is, similar to the way claim 1 was amended to include the “accepts as input” and the “provides as output” limitations of claims 10 and 11, claim 7 has been amended to include claim 8’s “provides as output” at least in the alternative to claim 7’s original “accepts as input” limitation.

Claim 7 is allowable because it includes the limitations of intervening claims 1 and 6 as originally filed, and can cover three different situations. First, claim 7 can include the “accepts as input” limitation as originally filed, and which has been considered allowable subject matter by the Examiner. Second, claim 7 can include the “provides as output” limitation of claim 8, and

which has been considered allowable subject matter by the Examiner in relation to claim 8. Third, claim 7 can include both the “accepts as input” and the “provides as output” limitations.

Furthermore, claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 7, rather than from claim 1. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9. Claims 9-11 are allowable at least because their base independent claim, claim 7, is allowable.

Claims 17-18

Claims 17 and 18 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of their base independent claims and any intervening claims. However, Applicant believes that the Examiner may have intended to formally allow claims 17 and 18 because claim 17 is an independent claim, and claim 18 directly depends from claim 17. Therefore, insofar as claims 17 and 18 contain allowable subject matter, there is no need for either claim to be rewritten in independent form because claim 17 is already in independent form and claim 18 depends directly from claim 17. Therefore, formal allowance of claims 17-18 is requested.

Claims 19-20

Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 19 and 20 is now moot.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. For at the reasons discussed, this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 2, 2005

Date



SCOTT R. BOALICK  
Registration No. 42,337  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)